

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 14-1029V

Filed: January 15, 2016

* * * * *

UNPUBLISHED

SANDRA and REUBEN CALIXTO,
Parents of D.C., a minor,

*

*

*

Petitioners,

*

*

v.

*

Special Master Hamilton-Fieldman

SECRETARY OF HEALTH
AND HUMAN SERVICES,

*

*

*

Respondent.

*

Attorneys' Fees and Costs;

Reasonable Amount Requested to
which Respondent Does Not Object.

* * * * *

Edward Kraus, Law Offices of Chicago Kent, Chicago, IL, for Petitioners.

Adriana Teitel, United States Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

DECISION¹

On October 23, 2014, Sandra and Reuben Calixto ("Petitioners") filed a petition for compensation on behalf of their son, D.C., under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, 42 U.S.C. §§ 300aa-1 *et seq.* (2006) ("Vaccine Act"). Petitioners alleged that the administration of a Hepatitis B ("Hep B") vaccine on April 5, 2012 caused D. C. to suffer from pancytopenia and severe transfusion-dependent aplastic anemia. On December 4, 2015, the undersigned issued a decision dismissing the petition.

On January 14, 2016, the parties filed a Stipulation of Facts Concerning Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Pursuant to their Stipulation, the parties have agreed to an award of \$23,350.00 in attorneys' fees and costs. In accordance with General Order Number 9, Petitioners' counsel represents that Petitioners have not incurred any out-of-pocket litigation costs in pursuit of their claim.

¹ Because this unpublished decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, the undersigned intends to post this decision on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-347, § 205, 116 Stat. 2899, 2913 (codified as amended at 44 U.S.C. § 3501 and note (2006)). In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), a party has 14 days to identify and move to delete medical or other information, that satisfies the criteria in § 300aa-12(d)(4)(B). Further, consistent with the rule requirement, a motion for redaction must include a proposed redacted decision. If, upon review, the undersigned agrees that the identified material fits within the requirements of that provision, such material will be deleted from public access.

The undersigned finds that this petition was brought in good faith and that there existed a reasonable basis for the claim. Therefore, an award for fees and costs is appropriate, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 300aa-15(b) and (e)(1). Further, the proposed amount seems reasonable and appropriate. **Accordingly, the undersigned hereby awards the amount of \$23,350.00, in the form of a check made payable jointly to Petitioners and Petitioners' counsel, Edward Kraus.**

In the absence of a motion for review filed pursuant to RCFC Appendix B, the clerk of the court **SHALL ENTER JUDGMENT** in accordance with the terms of the parties' stipulation.²

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Lisa Hamilton-Fieldman
Lisa Hamilton-Fieldman
Special Master

² Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), entry of judgment is expedited by the parties' joint filing of notice renouncing the right to seek review.